

artwurl.org – november, 2005

WORKING: a conversation between Andrea Geyer, Sharon Hayes, Ashley Hunt, Maryam Jafri, Kara Lynch, Ulrike Müller, Valerie Tevere, David Thorne and Alex Villar.

As an artist I have always understood my work as a combination of different practices. One of them is the ongoing discourse that I have with my colleagues around working, teaching, politics, and theory and of course the challenges of every day living. By its nature this discourse is rarely public. Being invited by Carlos Motta, to contribute to artwurl.org in form of an interview, I suggested that instead of generating a new conversation, I would invite some of my colleagues to formalize some of the already existing dialogues that we have and have had over the years to be contributed to the magazine. What brings this group of artists together, I think, is a shared agency in our work that I hope will become visible in some of its layers over the course of this conversation. Formally we decided to each ask one question which will be answered by everybody else. We will publish the questions in succession over the course of the next issues of artwurl.org. I would like to thank you Carlos Motta for his invitation giving us the opportunity to develop this dialogue. — Andrea Geyer

Stage 6:

Question by Ulrike Müller

Ulrike Müller: This turns out to be a quite loopy conversation, or am I the only one who feels like repeating myself? I don't mind it so much since repeating myself is part of what I do as an artist, repeating myself in different situations in shifting forms. Anyway, I'd like to spin off from the political analysis and philosophical questions back towards artists' concerns and art observations. A question intended to loop back to your desks and studios. How does what has been said so far manifest itself in your art work and its distribution?

I've been seeing a growing number of films works (many of them in 35mm) in gallery and museum shows lately. A lot of former video art gone fancy, and expensive, and in regards to the digital revolution that's happening in the entertainment industry, nostalgic. While I really liked some of the pieces I've seen, I've been wondering about what happened to video. In this

artwurl.org – november, 2005

Observation, I'd like to wrap up my question about formats and channels of distribution.

I found video as a feminist and as an activist medium that could be distributed inside and outside of art institutions. The realization that I could simply hand on a tape (like passing on a word), the fact that screenings could easily be organized or improvised in all kinds of settings, are banal observations that nevertheless were significant to me when I started using video in my work. What happened to cheap and democratic access to the production of moving images? What is interesting to you in gallery situations? If it's a model situation what for, and what can be achieved in it?

And, looping further to a more philosophical level – the paradigm of projection work brings up installation questions to which I'd like to have other people's perspectives on. How about all the shadows we throw on film and video screens? I read them as an interest that involves the viewer. Do you let yourself be involved? And how do you involve others in your work?

So, I am speaking to you as artists, as well as museum visitors and gallery goers and look forward to hearing from you.



David Thorne (February 5, Damascus, Syria (small wheel on the axis of evil)): There are several questions rolled into Ulrike's introduction to this

artwurl.org – november, 2005

round, but I will attempt to address only the first: How does what has been said so far manifest itself in your art work and its distribution?

While I recognize this as a fairly straightforward, “almost practical” question about how, for instance, the notion of democracy as discussed in the previous exchange might be taken up in the making and distribution of work, there is an implication in the way the question is framed—or perhaps it is better to say, since I don’t want to assume that Ulrike is making this implication, that the question has in it, for lack of a better word, a “fissure,” an opening up to a potential schism, or at least to a larger field of questions about what constitutes practice and about the discourse of “productivity” within the situation of what we might call “actually existing free market capitalism.” I am referring to the schism between process and product out of which a thousand alienations bloom.

Or perhaps I should just say that I am appropriating Ulrike’s *loopiness* here as a way to reiterate several of the questions Andrea posed in the last round, which pertain precisely to this situation:

“(What would a desired context for artwork look like? What does one call successful in terms of work? Can we at all imagine an adequate representation of interesting, challenging work being done within a supported and visible field? What is our role as acting individuals towards a collective that unmistakably forms us and I would claim always sustains us?)”

Let’s take this discussion as an example. Are we not being productive? Is this exchange not part of our work? Who makes the measures, for what constitutes “work,” or what constitutes “success”? Perhaps I am looking for a cheap answer to Ulrike’s first question, since I am merely suggesting something obvious—that this discussion is part of “my” work. Indeed, I engage it in my studio, at my desk. Obviously yes -but not as simple as that. The pressures of the situation of an actually existing free market capitalism, and its peculiar spawn called the contemporary art scene, do not let one off the hook so easily. May I “get personal”? I am of late persistently plagued by the thought, or even the fear, that I am not “making anything”—a pernicious phrase to which, just to compound its perniciousness, we should add the adjective “new.” And this period of not “making anything new” comes on the heels of a relatively so-called productive time, in which, among other things (for let it not be said that I only worked on a single project rather than a veritable profusion of projects, which should be the true measure of my creative—or better, intellectual—capacities...), I traveled to numerous film and video festivals with a short single-channel video piece as part of the

artwurl.org – november, 2005

Speculative Archive project. This piece received a fair amount of very positive attention, and as partial consequence I find that I am applying a strange kind of pressure to myself to “make more” and soon. At the same time, however, I am questioning this imperative to produce according to some specific yet unwritten schedule in order to remain in play, so to speak, or to maintain visibility with the right people, and so on: “It would be good to hit this circuit again with a new work within two years if possible, otherwise we might never work in this town again.” And, recognizing as well that the previous project involved 3 years of work to realize, to yield “product,” and that the new project may well take another 3 years, a production schedule that does not necessarily conform with the dictates of the situation in terms of viable output and market visibility.

Andrea’s remarks from the last round underscored something of the importance of asking with this tension I am describing above in mind, “What do artists want?” or, less reductively, what are the sources and consequences of this sort of dilemma, of these pressures? Or, what is at stake here? One wants to be firm in one’s one convictions, if not idealistic, and say, “There should not be a dilemma of this sort.” And yet we are not immune to certain pressures and desires, even if they conflict with what we are able to intellectualize and materialize about/through our practices. Nonetheless, this discussion, which is both process and product, is one way of working in which I experience something of the potential to mitigate these pressures and to change the situation.

As for the preponderance of film and video installation works in the galleries and museums, and what we might characterize as the partial disappearance of so-called activist video from these contexts, perhaps others will take up Ulrike’s questions more succinctly than I am able to. I will only say, from my least cynical side, assuming the perspective of a cock-eyed optimist enthralled in a *Benjaminian* sort of fashion with the latest developments in moving-image technologies, that there is a general opening up of access to certain technologies and capabilities of film and video production and that artists are taking advantage of and making work, sometimes in interesting, challenging, and complicated ways. “Simple as all that.” From a more cynical—or perhaps realist—perspective, it also almost always already seems to me that where there’s money to be made, or at the very least cultural capital to be accrued, or when there’s a potential new twist to spice up the cocktail hour, the galleries, curators and collectors certainly influence the tune, even if we could not say that they call it altogether. One success story breeds a hundred imitators, or if there’s a good game in town, everyone wants a piece of the action, or when you smell an emerging market,

position yourself to take advantage of the stink. Still, as pleasurable as it may be to brandish them, these sorts of truisms seem to obtain in every field of merchandising, and if we only badmouth the fact that art is, if only its most culturally prominent manifestation, one such field, do we not risk forfeiting something of our capacity to determine “what else” art can be, or risk sustaining in some way the dead weight of an over determined mode of production?

Alex Villar: The task at hand is quite complex: to comprehend and hopefully propose a meaningful response to Ulrike’s interrelated set of questions, which involve, as I understood them, the translation of one’s theoretical ideas into artistic practice, the shifting registers modulating alternative strategies of distribution, the influence of context in the cognitive experience and the potentiality for meaningful inter-subjective relations in the construction of situations. David’s choice to answer only the first of Ulrike’s questions introduces a possibly productive methodological alternative for our discussion in the sense that it could allow the group to advance further since each person would be working on a distinct aspect of the problem. I gave David’s method a try and dealt only with what Ulrike qualified as the ‘paradigm of projection work.’ Projection or, more specifically, the projection of still or moving images on the surfaces of the architecture of institutional spaces poses a number of questions about the significance of the material, sociological and historical conditions that inform this particular conjunction of image and support as they exceed previously established practices. Cinema for instance and the typical viewing situations that have conditioned its social reception has been presented with the possibility to re-imagine itself in the spatial settings of the exhibition space. The art video by its turn has in great part migrated from the TV monitor to the wall, a situation triggered in part by the necessity to articulate the physicality of the containing space and its active framing of the image. Clearly, both directions have generated inconsistent artistic output. In its poorest formulations cinema’s rich semiotic minefield is ignored in favor of a self-indulgent transmigration from the movie theater to the art space as if the change of context would in itself suffice as an artistic project. Conversely, the theoretical, aesthetic and political specificities of art pieces involving a consideration of the physical realm are overlooked in favor of an unexamined pursuit of spectacular presentation. In spite of such reifying operations or even to a certain extent—if partially—because of them, there are important matters of representation and discursive formation at stake in the articulations that are engendered in the very charged and susceptible moment of institutional validation. It is precisely at this crucial junction that critical tendencies can be rearticulated as innocuous brands of stylistic critical competences. Also, it is at such instances that particular truths

artwurl.org – november, 2005

are rhetorically substantiated as unarguable truths. This is exactly why a reflected participation in the established circuits of presentation, distribution and reception is a desirable component of the counter-hegemonic move toward a radically defined democratic project. But it is not solely a matter of



resisting, analyzing and ultimately exerting negative pressure in relation to power's recuperative operations. A productive detouring of situations and conventions may also be undertaken in what is essentially a positive proposition that does not need to lose sight of its ethical standpoint. Fear of indulging in relativist maneuvers has often kept people contained in a space of paralysis as well as inhabiting an imaginary outside position in relation to power. I do not see any reason why the communicative and experiential paradigms should be polarized. They are, after all, both constituted discursively and can best be utilized if complementarily deployed. The encounter of the viewer with the work presents a great opportunity to rethink the value of this engagement in more productive terms than those obtained by the deployment of diluted forms of participation based on ethereally conceived types of linkages. This encounter is extraordinarily important as it not only has to do with aesthetic cognition and its redefinition beyond the traditional parameters of transcendental contemplation; it also presents the occasion to involve subjects in collective reflection about the contingences ordering the world around them and more substantially about their own ability to effect change upon such circumstances.

artwurl.org – november, 2005

Andrea Geyer: I recently did a close reading of Yvonne Rainer's 1980 film *Journey's from Berlin 1971*. Thinking about Ulrike's question and David's and Alex's responses, I come back to this film and its strategies that address exactly questions of projection of image, text, memory, metaphor, shadow, shadow in the space, of the people, of text and of narrative. Or better, this film does not only address but complicates these issues.

Even though my thoughts about this film fold the question of projection from the museum space into the space of the film, I allow myself the detour because it moves my (polemic) question from round 5: *What do artist want?* to *What should a work of art do?* And brings it right to the discussion above.

In *Journey's from Berlin 1971* Yvonne describes basically two struggles against authority. One is the struggle against political authority and the other is Annette Michelson's struggle against the authority of psychoanalysis secession. Both are looked at parallel in their constitutions, executions, successes and failures. And both struggles are not merely documented but described from the distance through a subject, in reflection and projection: the struggle of the Russian resistance (Vera Finger/ Vera Zauslich) and the RAF (Ulrike Meinhof) by two "armchair" revolutionaries in New York preparing a gourmet dinner and the other by Annette Michelson (for 'an American') in the therapy, re-narrated by her anecdotally or through quoting others or sometimes read out of the diary. I am interested in this film in the context of our discussion because it does something really well, it incorporates in its structure already not only the construction of the author but also the construction of the viewer in relation to an event, a struggle, history, personally or politically. I am as a viewer of the film introduced at the second or third level of viewing/hearing things that are re-narrated, reflected upon or claimed. I find myself constructed in the film and outside of it, because each element used in the film is already commented on, let it be people, spaces, stories, objects, photographs, political facts, taken out of the singularity of an individual viewing into a larger field of many apparent audiences. Singularity in viewing is rendered impossible and leaves me sitting in the audience with the need of turning my head. (Which ties into a lot of Sharon's work but also into Ashley's). Through the parallel examination of Annette's experience and the experience of European revolutionaries, Yvonne also directs the film away from the explicit of one event and moves the production of meanings even further towards the viewer, meaning us. What I like about that is that there are not only one shadow of myself that falls onto the screen in the moment I enter the room of the film, but my shadow is multiplied and faceted and projected right back on me. The film as projection uses itself in all its mechanisms and multiplies them into the viewing situation. Every viewing is a

artwurl.org – november, 2005

projection, a reflection and most of all a participation of the viewers in the film or on the other side of that screen, individual but also in relation to each other, always discursive. And why am I thinking about all of this in relation to Ulrike's question? Because I am amazed of how complicated and complex work can inherently be in terms of viewing and the viewer and if I may say, because I feel that this is in a way *what art can do*.

To bring all of this back into the production of here and now, I feel especially with viewing the recent survey shows here in New York, I realize that there is a large production of contemporary work, that does not at all implicate the viewer but rather keeps itself satisfied with the pleasure of being looked at, the discrete object or contemplation, or consumption, or entertainment. (Maybe that then has to be result of what David was describing earlier, as the tease of 'the money to be'.) But then also I wonder if it might be the construction of the viewing situations of group shows in the white cubes of institutions that offer nothing else but that? So where and how can "non-discrete" work or work that tries to imply the viewer directly be seen? But this is a whole other discussion to take up in my series of (polemic) questions. *What are the spaces we want for art?* That I will leave for the next round or others to consider and only say that I agree with Alex, on possibility for me to see this kind of work can be (not only but better) in relation to each other — opening up an exhibition space of non-entertainment.

Maryam Jafri: I like this question a lot. As someone who as worked both with high 8 low budget TV monitor videos and with large-scale video projections with high (for me) production values I definitely think this is relevant. High production values lend an authority to the artwork and by extension the institution that shows it or the collector that owns it. This point is important to recognize. And as a teacher when I present my work I make sure to emphasize this particular point and I try to show a range of video works so that people realize there are many forms of video art practice. The problem is that a lot of the early 70s video art that I also really love and was inspired by is often unknown to students or younger artists. Their encounters with moving images are shaped through MTV/TV or film. Video is not just a cheap way to make film and I think it is a major mistake to show students or younger artists a selection of only feature films –and this happens way too much. Partly it is because a lot of people simply don't know the history and again, this is a big problem. Also, unfortunately a lot of the early video art is expensive to rent. I wanted Valerie's export's touch tape for class but we couldn't afford to pay \$500 for a 2 min video. Secondly, I personally enjoy working with both ends of the video practice because in making these large scale installation projection works, one spends half the time on

artwurl.org – november, 2005

administration, paperwork, fundraising etc... and I enjoy the immediacy of working with video—one of the main reasons I was drawn to it in the first place. The camera as a pencil. Video as drawing or writing. That said, I also think Ulrike's question though important again must be recognized in historical terms, the first 60's Sony Portapak that came out was large, bulky, with grainy black and white image and poor sound so that technologically it in no way could compete with or even reference film. Therefore video *had* to be something different than film. This has changed with the advent of first mini DV, then digital beta and now, HD.



Kara Lynch: *how does what has been said so far manifest in my work:: what artists want out of work :: video projection?*

I'll be as brief as possible and work backwards.

I'm as annoyed as the next person who has put time and effort into thinking about what makes video *video* and installation *installation* when I walk into a gallery or museum and see what really is just a single channel short video or series of videos or even feature film length/style video projected on a wall in a dimly lit alcove or room and it's called "video installation". I just think, why not rent out a theater. Why not show it in a festival, your living room, a local community center on a monitor with a VCR or DVD player? Why not make a dub and send it to everyone you know? Why this room, at this time, with this audience? But then I just get over it and

artwurl.org – november, 2005

remember that the market is such that folks are encouraged to present their work this way even if I don't think they have done much to consider the site or the form in relation to their content and intent.

I can't get worked up about it or be a purist. I've started to work with large-scale video projection in outdoor spaces because I'm interested in how people move through architecture and what it says about daily rituals. My work is about violence and its casual occurrences. I think that my intent expands when embedded into a passageway or stairwell because it emphasizes the everyday-ness of how we ignore certain violence. This tact exploits spectacle, but only when the sun goes down. That's when the images are visible. And when the sun goes down, a lot can change. A sunny day by the river may become the stage for a lynching or a rape or a beat down. And depending on your position, you may be able to walk right by without noticing, or move slowly watching your back listening for footsteps. You might even be the perpetrator. Either actor is involved. And yet, these details float invisible for some, while inescapable for others. I am not articulating this well but it is something about the dirt beneath the surfaces and piecing together tiny details to find that each beautiful flicker of light reveals the things we've worked so hard not to see or feel. Expanding the work beyond the monitor and out of my head is tremendous for me.

Now back to the beginning. I don't know if anyone else has noticed but in all of my responses I have worked to position myself within this conversation. For me this has been about race and identity and making sense of where this fits into the dialog. At the end of it all, when the round robin is edited and compiled, I feel a bit outside. I don't feel ignored because it's not about marginalization. It's just clear that not everyone is compelled to position themselves in these terms. I constantly reconsider where these concerns fall in this conversation about art making and our political present. This is always my conversation with making art. Questions of race, identity, power and privilege continue to anchor my work regardless of whether anyone else is listening. I identify with people for whom democracy has consistently proved to be a lot of smoke and mirrors. I make art to shift the paradigm -- that's what I want out of it.

Ashley Hunt: I have a lot to say about video, about projection and the space(s) in which such work is produced and displayed. As a video maker, one who was educated in video art specifically (not video as a cheap mode of filmmaking—in fact, my school's video department had historically been an antagonist to the film department), I think a good deal about the prevalence

artwurl.org – november, 2005

of video today, about its fetishization, the habitual tendencies of its display, of video as a choice of medium or material in the first place. All this said, after Kara's response I can't help but feel (initially) what I was preparing this round to be a bit formalistic.

To indulge this formalism, I would add to the insights mentioned already (the uncritical cinematic impulse, the spectacular and the monumental projection, as well as the challenges of "video" pedagogy), that the ubiquity of large wall projection for displaying video today is analogous to the earlier tendency (when there was still a question as to whether video was indeed "art") to prop TV monitors on pedestals, as if the TV and the pedestal (white and rectangular like the gallery space) did not have any more meaning than the white walls of the gallery (as if they too had no meaning). The fascination with video projection since it has become possible is too often borne of this same tendency, which considers the apparatus and structure of that "aesthetic abomination" of the (non-art object) TV set disappeared, the "pure" image projected onto a wall as neutral as the podium had been treated before. Equally ubiquitous is the claim that such projection is automatically "video installation," when it is often no more installation than a big ass Delacroix painting hung on a wall; in fact I'm not so sure it's an altogether different gesture. (David Joselit has recently been writing about certain large video projections as linked to the investigation begun in certain Modernist painting, in its spatial, phenomenological aspects.)

But to return to Kara's other point, and to whether what I've said so far is in fact guilty of formalism (of course it's critiquing formalism, but could that intention be already positioned within a more formalist framework?), I'd say we've talked a lot in this conversation about where one another are coming from, about whether or not this seems to matter to us and to our work, not to mention that we're all working at a moment in which the way that *who we are* relates to *what we produce* is trivialized, exoticized, refused and negated. Akin to the constant attempt to universalize or generalize (consumer-ize, homogenize) audience, the question of *from where we speak* is again and again positioned as outside the field of meaning, or conversely, is used to overdetermine that field. (Corresponding to both these possibilities, I have yet to hear the phrase, "As a white artist, Ashley Hunt's work is obviously about...")

As Kara has pointed out however, that not everyone in this dialogue appears compelled to speak in terms of race and identity, that these are not terms upon which we all insist when talking about work, this doesn't mean that we don't each think about it or are not conscious of it at play in the

artwurl.org – november, 2005

meanings we produce, or more so, in the opportunities we are offered. Nonetheless, I wonder if Kara's point suggests something else we're not quite getting at.

Obviously, this question is not for me alone to answer. But I can at least speculate that what's not gotten at is the *whatever it is* that affords to some of us the feeling that the current moment—in which we are all compelled to speak to such questions—is an exception; that we are still not interrogating (or are dancing around) a normative position from which the day-to-day state of violence, siege or crisis (whether on the level of war-making, identity-creating, space-producing) goes un-perceived, ignored, or is, more perniciously, consumed and lived off; a normative position from which such violence is exteriorized and made someone else's concern, even if that gesture is made out of a good faith desire "to not speak for others"; a normative position whose presumed innocence of such concerns is itself a position of violence; a normative position for whom the system usually "works," in contradistinction to those for whom it has not, does not work, irregardless of the "current conditions." Indeed, it is the very flattened position we are asked to speak from as artists within a rationalized, alienating, market-centered political economy. It is also the position implied when asked to divorce questions of form from those of politics, of politics from art and culture, from philosophy and ethics.

So as to whether our considerations of new, "gone fancy" video projection is a formalist endeavor, this is precisely the point of, the stakes in discussing form. That is, to not allow works of important content but lacking in formal rigor to get off easy, but more importantly, to wrench questions of form away from a hermetic, art historical discourse, from the objectifying force of the market, from a technological determinist and fetishistic rationale, and insist upon its discussion in terms of how we produce audiences, spaces and meanings, how we open up positions and discursive fields from which we ourselves and others can speak, contest, formulate and re-formulate such ideas, the relations we want to see in the world, while always opening up who has access to such discourse.

While Ulrike in her question asks us to depart from the "political and philosophical," this request is ultimately (re)framed by her own position, her own politics as a feminist, for whom video had originally functioned as a radical or activist mode of production and distribution. And I do not assume that when Ulrike addresses us as "gallery and museum goers," that this is per se to negate our politics, position or identity, but is in terms of—given what we've all said so far—what do we bring with us to such spaces? What do we

artwurl.org – november, 2005

add to them, demand of them, how do we contribute to what they perceive themselves to be, and our insistent expectation that they be more public and less exclusive than they are. Or do we boycott them altogether and forge new institutions better suited to our ideas?

Considering this approach to form, and the formal structures of institutions that exist, can I twist David and Andrea's reformulation of Ulrike's question further, so as to ask: *What are the modalities through which such thought, such discourse, such positioning are given form, life and some force of interrogation in the larger world?*



Valerie Tevere: Yes, I too have been curious of the use of 'video installation' for a work that may or may not contain multiple monitors or large-scale projections. Is it is fashionable or more appealing to speak of a work as an installation? Or a matter of semantics in that the addition of the term separates the work from one that sits in a screening room context? When I see such work I question the relationship between the projected visual content, its spatialization, the architecture of said space, and audience. Yet this seems to have been hashed out thus far in the conversation. And as always, there is quite a lot to consider here and I feel that my response my take it further into another discussion.

artwurl.org – november, 2005

I'd like to speak to Ulrike's use of nostalgia in terms of artistic production, the 'video art gone fancy' as more artists are using 35mm film within their practices. While digital imaging can mimic film, a possible draw to 35mm could be the tactility, the look of film, and sound of the projector, along with high market values and institutional legitimacy (as was mentioned in a few previous entries). I sense a similarity with the return to and use of the term radio (this is where I digress from time-based visuals to sonic broadcast). Since the late 90's, in different collaborative forms, I have been working with and through the medium of radio and its conceptual application. My work, as a part of the collaborative neuroTransmitter, focuses on the occupation of the radio spectrum, application of low power FM, history, and political nature of such work and action against federal regulations on communication. Primarily over the last year (but even the year prior) I have noticed the term pop up in many artistic contexts – someone recently had even mentioned to me that "you got in at the *right time* as radio is really cool these days..." Does this 'coolness' have to do with nostalgia for early communicative forms? In the art context, a lot of what has been proffered as radio is programmatic and happens over the Internet. I don't want to get into any sort of dichotomous purist, populist, or analog vs. digital conversation here, nor focus on the technical differences and similarities of these parallel forms of production and communication – but I do wonder about its current hipness. As Maryam had mentioned, I think not knowing the history is an important point. While radio has been largely a tool for distributive communication rather than an art form, artists have been working with the broadcast spectrum for decades -- over the course of the 20thC experimental works have been produced that question and complicate the medium and the one-sided hierarchy of broad transmission.

So where does this take us? To return to Ulrike's questions and their various reformulations -- I am most interested in the motivation of production, the questioning and complicating of positionalities and of *what art can be*. What I've learned and appreciate from these myriad *Working* discussions is that formalist pursuits are not the primary drive of our practices, it's obvious. I wonder what our discussion would be like if such were the case.

All Images selected and © by **Ulrike Müller**

CVs and weblinks:

Andrea Geyer lives and works in New York. Her work stresses the possibility of defining complex fluid identities in opposition to mechanisms which attempt

artwurl.org – november, 2005

to form and control static collective identities. Big cities are recognized as sites for projected images and fantasies, places of diverse political, ethnic, religious and social realities, integrating relations between human beings and their surroundings. Her work has been exhibited internationally, including the Whitney Museum of American Art, Serpentine Gallery, Secession, Manifesta4, PS1 Contemporary Art Center, Parlour Projects and White Columns. She is a 2000 participant of the Whitney Independent Study Program. In 2003 she received a NYFA fellowship as well as a IASPIS residency. She is currently a resident at the Woolworth building LMCC space program. Over the recent years she has been involved in various curatorial and organizational projects among them Nomads and Residents, New York.

Sharon Hayes is an artist who employs conceptual and methodological approaches 14 borrowed from practices such as theater, dance, anthropology and journalism. In her most recent work, she has been investigating the present political moment through a critical examination of various historic texts, including a speech from the 1968 democratic convention in Chicago and the transcripts from the audio-tapes made by Patti Hearst and the Symbionese Liberation Army in the 1970s. Her work has been shown in gallery spaces and theatrical venues including the New Museum of Contemporary Art, P.S.1 Contemporary Art Center, Andrew Kreps Gallery, Dance Theater Workshop, Performance Space 122, and the WOW Cafe in New York City. Hayes was a 1999 MacDowell Colony Fellow. She also received a 1999 New York Foundation for the Arts Fellowship and a IASPIS residency in 2003.

Ashley Hunt is a Los Angeles based artist who works primarily in video and multimedia. His main project of the last five years has been the "Corrections Documentary Project", exploring the political economy and relations of U.S. prison expansion.

<http://ashleyhuntwork.net>
<http://correctionsproject.com>
<http://prisonmaps.com>

Maryam Jafri is a video artist based in New York and Copenhagen. Her work centers on performance, narrative and gender. Her work has been shown in numerous exhibitions and screenings both in the US and abroad.

Kara Lynch is a time -based artist stretching her limits into space. Her work criss-crosses media, but she will own performance as her discipline and point of departure. Recent works include: 'Black Russians' 2001 117min

artwurl.org – november, 2005

documentary video; 'Mi Companera' 2002 12min video; 'Xing Over' 2003 6hr performance/2.36min 3 channel audio piece; 'Invisible: episode 03 meet me in Okemah, Ok circa 1911' 2003, 7day audio/video installation. En exilio in La Jolla California, she retains a post office box in New York and a storage space in Western Massachusetts. She is a Gemini monkey born in the momentous year of 1968.

Ulrike Müller lives and works in Vienna/Austria and in New York. She studied at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna and in 2002/2003 was a participant in the Whitney Independent Study Program. As an artist she is interested in a critical feminist perspective on social, political and economic developments and their impact on everyday life.

Valerie Tevere - Driven by discursive practices, Tevere's work has looked to the public sphere as a condition and framework for inquiry and discourse. Recent projects permeate the urban environment as temporal public works and performances that rely upon structured yet spontaneous encounters with city inhabitants. Tevere's solo and collaborative projects have been exhibited internationally at venues throughout North and South America and Europe. She was a fellow of the Whitney Independent Study Program in 2000, a recipient of a Mellon Humanities fellowship at the CUNY Graduate Center 2002/03, and, as part of the radio collaborative neurotransmitter.

David Thorne lives and works in Los Angeles. His recent work has addressed the conditions of so-called globalization; notions of justice shot through with revenge; and memory practices in a moment of excessive rememorations. Current projects include "The Speculative Archive" (with Julia Meltzer); the ongoing series of photoworks, "Men in the News" (1991-present); and "Boom!" a collaboration with Oliver Ressler. <http://www.speculativearchive.org>

Alex Villar lives and works in New York. His work draws from interdisciplinary theoretical sources and employs video, installation and photography. His individual and collaborative projects are part of a long-term investigation and articulation of potential spaces of dissent in the urban landscape that has often taken the form of an exploration of negative spaces in architecture. His work has been exhibited internationally, including at the Institute of International Visual Arts in London, Museu de Arte Moderna in Sao Paulo, Paco Imperial in Rio de Janeiro, Tommy Lund and Overgaden in Copenhagen, Contemporary Art Centre in Vilnius, the Goteborg Konstmuseum in Sweden, Joanna Kamm in Berlin, Arsenal in Poland, Lichthaus in Bremen and Halle für Kunst in Luneburg, Exit Art, Stux Gallery, the Art Container and Dorsky

artwurl.org – november, 2005

Gallery in New York. He holds an MFA degree from Hunter College and is a 2000 graduate of the Whitney ISP. In 2003, he received a NYFA fellowship.
<http://www.de-tour.org>